



Technical Committee 184: Industrial automation systems and integration
Subcommittee 4: Industrial data

ISO TC 184/SC4 N677

**ISO CD Ballot Results
for 15531-1**

**Industrial automation systems and integration – Industrial data –
Manufacturing management data exchange – Part 1: Overview and
fundamental principles**

ISO 15531-1 was circulated among SC4 members for its CD Ballot and closed on 1997-12-22. Thirteen of our nineteen P-members responded to the ballot:

| COUNTRY | VOTE | WITH COMMENT |
|--------------------|-------------|---------------------|
| Australia | AGREE | |
| Belgium | | |
| Brazil | AGREE | |
| Canada | | |
| China | | |
| France | AGREE | |
| Germany | AGREE | |
| Hungary | AGREE | |
| Italy | AGREE | |
| Japan | AGREE | |
| Korea, Republic of | AGREE | |
| Netherlands | ABSTAIN | |
| Norway | | |
| Romania | AGREE | |
| Russia | | |
| Sweden | AGREE | |
| Switzerland | | |
| United Kingdom | DISAGREE | X |
| United States | DISAGREE | X |

The [Secretary/Chair] has reviewed the ballot responses, and in consultation with the [Secretary/Chair] proposes that the next draft of 15531-1 will go forward for registration as a Draft International Standard.

The comments received from this ballot can also be found in digital form on SOLIS via ftp or www:
http://www.mel.nist.gov/step/parts/xxx/cd/bal_cmt/.

Address reply to:

ISO TC 184/SC4 Secretariat

National Institute of Standards and Technology

Building 220, Room A127

Gaithersburg, MD 20899 USA

Phone: +1-301-975-3982 Telefax: +1-301-975-4694 Email: trager@cme.nist.gov url - <http://www.nist.gov/sc4/>

CD BALLOT COMMENTS ON 15531-1

UNITED KINGDOM

ISSUE NUMBER: UK1-1.

AUTHOR: Jon Owen

CLAUSE: Definitions

CLASSIFICATION: Major Technical

DESCRIPTION: Should 10303-11 be used as the source for entity and universe of discourse?

PROPOSED RESOLUTION:

ISSUE NUMBER: UK1-2.

AUTHOR: Jon Owen

CLAUSE: Definitions

CLASSIFICATION: Major Technical

DESCRIPTION: EXPRESS-2 may cover some of the purposes for the time-based modelling

PROPOSED RESOLUTION:

ISSUE NUMBER: UK1-3.

AUTHOR: Jon Owen

CLAUSE: Definitions

CLASSIFICATION: Major Technical

DESCRIPTION: Will 10303-49 be used to support the modelling of processes?

PROPOSED RESOLUTION:

Editorial COMMENTS

MAJOR EDITORIAL COMMENTS

ISSUE NUMBER: UK1-4.

AUTHOR: Jon Owen

CLAUSE: All

CLASSIFICATION: Major Editorial

DESCRIPTION: The English needs to be improved, including the correction of spellings (such as behavior and modeling) and use of ...

PROPOSED RESOLUTION:

ISSUE NUMBER: UK1-5.

AUTHOR: Jon Owen

CLAUSE: All

CLASSIFICATION: Major Editorial

DESCRIPTION: The layout needs to be improved, particularly the definitions and widow headings.

PROPOSED RESOLUTION:

MINOR EDITORIAL COMMENTS

ISSUE NUMBER: UK1-6.

AUTHOR: Jon Owen

CLAUSE: 4.1 Last paragraph

CLASSIFICATION: Minor Editorial

DESCRIPTION: This gives requirements on the standard itself, which is inappropriate.

PROPOSED RESOLUTION:

ISSUE NUMBER: UK1-7.

AUTHOR: Jon Owen

CLAUSE: 4.3

CLASSIFICATION: Minor Editorial

DESCRIPTION: There are links here with operational logistics, which it would be useful to make explicit.

PROPOSED RESOLUTION:

ISSUE NUMBER: UK1-8.

AUTHOR: Jon Owen

CLAUSE: 6 and 7

CLASSIFICATION: Minor Editorial

DESCRIPTION: These cannot be part of the main body of the document and remain informative: either they should be moved to informative annexes, or the material should be used as examples in the main body of the document.

PROPOSED RESOLUTION:

UNITED STATES

ISSUE: USA-Mandate1-1

AUTHOR: US

CLAUSE: General

CLASSIFICATION: Major, Technical

DESCRIPTION: This document has a lot of boilerplate, but not sufficient technical detail to identify what MANDATE really does. It needs to be expanded to the next level of depth.

PROPOSED SOLUTION:

RESOLUTION:

ISSUE: USA-Mandate1-2

AUTHOR: US

CLAUSE: General

CLASSIFICATION: Major, Technical

DESCRIPTION: Parts 21, 31, and 41 are all entitled Overview and Fundamental Principles. Currently, this part (Part 1) is an "overview of overviews". Are the 20, 30 and 40 series parts independent of each other, or are they part of one integrated standard? If they are independent, then they should be assigned different ISO standard numbers. If they are part of one integrated standard, then their contents should be combined into this document.

PROPOSED SOLUTION:

RESOLUTION:

ISSUE: USA-Mandate1-3

AUTHOR: US

CLAUSE: General

CLASSIFICATION: Major, Technical

DESCRIPTION: This document is an overview of what needs to be done and does not put in place any guiding principles (except definitions).

PROPOSED SOLUTION: If MANDATE is to be the "integrator" of standards, then the definitions need to be taken from the other standards that MANDATE is going to work with. MANDATE needs to define a framework for what they are doing and not talk about the need for a framework.

RESOLUTION:

ISSUE: USA-Mandate1-4

AUTHOR: US

CLAUSE: General

CLASSIFICATION: Minor, Technical

DESCRIPTION: 15531 states that it will be consistent with 10303 and 13584, but does not explain how or how the standards are to interoperate.

PROPOSED SOLUTION: See description.

RESOLUTION:

ISSUE: USA-Mandate1-5

AUTHOR: US

CLAUSE: General

CLASSIFICATION: Minor, Editorial

DESCRIPTION: There are numerous references to MANDATE, P-LIB and STEP throughout the document. These are not official titles.

PROPOSED SOLUTION: Replace with ISO 15531, ISO 13584 and ISO 10303, respectively.

RESOLUTION:

ISSUE: USA-Mandate1-6

AUTHOR: US

CLAUSE: General

CLASSIFICATION: Minor, Editorial

DESCRIPTION: Parentheses should not be used in normative text.

PROPOSED SOLUTION: Remove the parentheses if the parenthesized text is an amplification of what precedes. Move the parenthesized text to a note or example otherwise.

RESOLUTION:

ISSUE: USA-Mandate1-7

AUTHOR: US

CLAUSE: Foreword, pages iii-iv

CLASSIFICATION: Major, Editorial

DESCRIPTION: The Foreword lists a set of 15531 standards that are not in existence. For example Part 22, Part 23. Until these parts are standards they should not be referenced. The names of the standards may change as they progress through the standards approval cycle and they may be rejected. The approach should be to list a series of standards and what their application domain is (e.g., production data for external exchange).

PROPOSED SOLUTION: Take out references to standards that do not exist.

RESOLUTION:

ISSUE: USA-Mandate1-8

AUTHOR: US

CLAUSE: Foreword, paragraph 2, page iii

CLASSIFICATION: Minor, Editorial

DESCRIPTION: There is an extra space between "by" and "technical". There is an extra space on either side of the percent sign.

PROPOSED SOLUTION: Remove the spaces.

RESOLUTION:

ISSUE: USA-Mandate1-9

AUTHOR: US

CLAUSE: Foreword, paragraph 3, page iii

CLASSIFICATION: Minor, Editorial

DESCRIPTION: "International Standard ISO 15531-1 "Manufacturing Management Data"" is not the proper way to refer to the standard.

PROPOSED SOLUTION: Change to "This part of ISO 15531".

RESOLUTION:

ISSUE: USA-Mandate1-10

AUTHOR: US

CLAUSE: Foreword, bullet item 1, page iii

CLASSIFICATION: Minor, Editorial

DESCRIPTION: The title given for Part 1 is incorrect.

PROPOSED SOLUTION: Change to the title as shown on the cover sheet.

RESOLUTION:

ISSUE: USA-Mandate1-11

AUTHOR: US

CLAUSE: Foreword, bullet item 1 subitem a, page iii

CLASSIFICATION: Minor, Editorial

DESCRIPTION: There is an extra space before the word "for".

PROPOSED SOLUTION: Remove the space.

RESOLUTION:

ISSUE: USA-Mandate1-12

AUTHOR: US

CLAUSE: Foreword, bullet items, page iii

CLASSIFICATION: Major, Editorial

DESCRIPTION: Parts 21, 31 and 41 are all called "Overview and fundamental principles". The same title should not be used for more than one part of any standard.

PROPOSED SOLUTION: Rename the parts.

RESOLUTION:

ISSUE: USA-Mandate1-13

AUTHOR: US

CLAUSE: Foreword, bullet items, page iii

CLASSIFICATION: Minor, Editorial

DESCRIPTION: The word "Manufacturing" is capitalized for no apparent reason.

PROPOSED SOLUTION: Change to lower case.

RESOLUTION:

ISSUE: USA-Mandate1-14

AUTHOR: US

CLAUSE: Introduction, page v

CLASSIFICATION: Major, Editorial

DESCRIPTION: The first two to three pages of the introduction talk about the SC4 series of standards. This does not tell about this standard. In fact, ISO 14959 is not going to be a SC4 standard. This adds nothing to the document. The introduction does not even relate the 15531 standard to these standards. The last section of Introduction explaining background to MANDATE should stay in the Introduction, but be expanded upon.

PROPOSED SOLUTION: Delete the explanation of other SC4 standards. Add to the explanation of the MANDATE standard.

RESOLUTION:

ISSUE: USA-Mandate1-15

AUTHOR: US

CLAUSE: Introduction, paragraph 2, page v

CLASSIFICATION: Minor, Technical

DESCRIPTION: Although the text says "These areas include", what follows is a list of standards, not a list of areas.

PROPOSED SOLUTION: Change the list of standards to a list of areas.

RESOLUTION:

ISSUE: USA-Mandate1-16

AUTHOR: US

CLAUSE: Introduction, paragraph 2, bullet item 2, page v

CLASSIFICATION: Minor, Editorial

DESCRIPTION: "Library" should not be capitalized.

PROPOSED SOLUTION: Change to lower case.

RESOLUTION:

ISSUE: USA-Mandate1-17

AUTHOR: US

CLAUSE: Introduction, ISO 15531 section, paragraph 1, page vii

CLASSIFICATION: Minor, Editorial

DESCRIPTION: The third sentence is in italics for no apparent reason, and there is an extra space after "products" at the end of the sentence.

PROPOSED SOLUTION: Remove the italicization. Delete the space.

RESOLUTION:

ISSUE: USA-Mandate1-18

AUTHOR: US

CLAUSE: Introduction, ISO 15531 section, paragraph 2, page vii

CLASSIFICATION: Minor, Editorial

DESCRIPTION: "...a permanent seek of competitive advantage..." is not good English.

PROPOSED SOLUTION: Reword.

RESOLUTION:

ISSUE: USA-Mandate1-19

AUTHOR: US

CLAUSE: Introduction, ISO 15531 section, paragraph 2, page vii

CLASSIFICATION: Minor, Technical

DESCRIPTION: It is not clear that an organization can achieve a permanent competitive advantage through the use of standards, since if one organization adopts a standard and achieves an advantage, its competitors will follow suit to remain competitive.

PROPOSED SOLUTION: Delete "in the context of a permanent seek of competitive advantage".

RESOLUTION:

ISSUE: USA-Mandate1-20

AUTHOR: US

CLAUSE: Introduction, ISO 15531 section, paragraph 2, page vii

CLASSIFICATION: Minor, Editorial

DESCRIPTION: "...the most accurately as possible..." is not good English. "...under an electronic form..." is not good English.

PROPOSED SOLUTION: Change to "as accurately as possible" and "in an electronic form".

RESOLUTION:

ISSUE: USA-Mandate1-21

AUTHOR: US

CLAUSE: Introduction, ISO 15531 section, paragraph 3, page vii

CLASSIFICATION: Minor, Technical

DESCRIPTION:

PROPOSED SOLUTION: The word "Globally" has no apparent meaning in this context.

RESOLUTION: Delete.

ISSUE: USA-Mandate1-22

AUTHOR: US

CLAUSE: Introduction, ISO 15531 section, paragraph 3, page vii

CLASSIFICATION: Minor, Technical

DESCRIPTION:

PROPOSED SOLUTION: The terms "supplier plant", "main plant" and "master production scheduling" are not defined.

RESOLUTION: Add definitions of "supplier plant", "main plant" and "master production scheduling" to Clause 3.

ISSUE: USA-Mandate1-23

AUTHOR: US

CLAUSE: Introduction, paragraph 4, page v

CLASSIFICATION: Minor, Editorial

DESCRIPTION: The first sentence is missing a subject.

PROPOSED SOLUTION: Add one.

RESOLUTION:

ISSUE: USA-Mandate1-24

AUTHOR: US

CLAUSE: Introduction, second to last paragraph, page viii

CLASSIFICATION: Minor, Editorial

DESCRIPTION: The second sentence is way too long. Also, "data which" is incorrect.

PROPOSED SOLUTION: Split the sentence into several sentences.

RESOLUTION:

ISSUE: USA-Mandate1-25

AUTHOR: US

CLAUSE: Introduction, last paragraph, page viii

CLASSIFICATION: Minor, Editorial

DESCRIPTION: There appears to be an extra line break or space after "products."

PROPOSED SOLUTION: Remove it.

RESOLUTION:

ISSUE: USA-Mandate1-26

AUTHOR: US

CLAUSE: Introduction, last paragraph, page viii

CLASSIFICATION: Minor, Editorial

DESCRIPTION: "this overview" is not the correct way to refer to a part of a standard.

PROPOSED SOLUTION: Change to "this part of ISO 15531".

RESOLUTION:

ISSUE: USA-Mandate1-27

AUTHOR: US

CLAUSE: 1.1, paragraph 1, page 1

CLASSIFICATION: Minor, Technical

DESCRIPTION: The paragraph jumps too abruptly into talk of factories, plants and companies.

PROPOSED SOLUTION: Provide an overview of how factories, plants and companies relate to each other in the context of ISO 15531.

RESOLUTION:

ISSUE: USA-Mandate1-28

AUTHOR: US

CLAUSE: 1.1, paragraph 2, page 1

CLASSIFICATION: Minor, Technical

DESCRIPTION: The last sentence, "That means that any extensions..." is not part of the scope of the standard. It is meta-information about the standard, and belongs more properly in the Introduction.

PROPOSED SOLUTION: Remove this sentence from the scope. Possibly put it somewhere in the Introduction.

RESOLUTION:

ISSUE: USA-Mandate1-29

AUTHOR: US

CLAUSE: 1.2, bullet items, page 1

CLASSIFICATION: Minor, Technical

DESCRIPTION: It is bad form to refer to "standards developed in ISO TC184/SC4" because a reader who is not involved in standards development will have no idea what standards you are referring to. Also, standards may be reassigned to different technical committees after publication of this part.

PROPOSED SOLUTION: Refer to the standards by functional descriptions, not by who developed them.

RESOLUTION:

ISSUE: USA-Mandate1-30

AUTHOR: US

CLAUSE: 1.1

CLASSIFICATION: Minor, Technical

DESCRIPTION: The Scope statement includes two areas that are in scope. The introduction states three areas. They are related, but say different things. Need to clarify.

PROPOSED SOLUTION: Resolve differences between the Introduction and the Scope statements in 1.1.

RESOLUTION:

ISSUE: USA-Mandate1-31

AUTHOR: US

CLAUSE: Many places

CLASSIFICATION: Minor, Editorial

DESCRIPTION: When referencing this part of ISO 15531, the reference should be, "the part of ISO 15531" and should NOT be, "this Part 1 of ISO 15531".

PROPOSED SOLUTION:

RESOLUTION:

ISSUE: USA-Mandate1-32

AUTHOR: US

CLAUSE: 1.2

CLASSIFICATION: Major, Editorial

DESCRIPTION: Clause 1.2 appears to be introduction material.

PROPOSED SOLUTION: Move the contents of Clause 1.2 into the Introduction.

RESOLUTION:

ISSUE: USA-Mandate1-33

AUTHOR: US

CLAUSE: 2

CLASSIFICATION: Minor, Editorial

DESCRIPTION: In the first paragraph, the word "agreement" should be "agreements".

PROPOSED SOLUTION:

RESOLUTION:

ISSUE: USA-Mandate1-34

AUTHOR: US

CLAUSE: 3.3, paragraph, page 1

CLASSIFICATION: Minor, Editorial

DESCRIPTION: The colon is missing after "ISO 15258".

PROPOSED SOLUTION:

RESOLUTION:

ISSUE: USA-Mandate1-35

AUTHOR: US

CLAUSE: 3.4.1

CLASSIFICATION: Minor, Technical

DESCRIPTION: The term "semantic element" is not defined.

PROPOSED SOLUTION: Add a definition of semantic element to Clause 3.

RESOLUTION:

ISSUE: USA-Mandate1-36

AUTHOR: US

CLAUSE: 3.4.2

CLASSIFICATION: Minor, Editorial

DESCRIPTION: The word "endued" is not an English word.

PROPOSED SOLUTION:

RESOLUTION:

ISSUE: USA-Mandate1-37

AUTHOR: US

CLAUSE: 3.4.2

CLASSIFICATION: Minor, Editorial

DESCRIPTION: "e.g." should not be used in normative text.

PROPOSED SOLUTION: Move what follows "e.g." to an example.

RESOLUTION:

ISSUE: USA-Mandate1-38

AUTHOR: US

CLAUSE: 3.4.5, page 5

CLASSIFICATION: Minor, Technical

DESCRIPTION: The term "static representation" is not defined.

PROPOSED SOLUTION: Add a definition of "static representation" to Clause 3 or replace the term "static representation" with its meaning.

RESOLUTION:

ISSUE: USA-Mandate1-39
AUTHOR: US
CLAUSE: 3.4.6, page 5
CLASSIFICATION: Minor, Technical
DESCRIPTION: The term "enterprise model" is not defined.
PROPOSED SOLUTION: Add a definition to Clause 3.
RESOLUTION:

ISSUE: USA-Mandate1-40
AUTHOR: US
CLAUSE: 3.4.8, page 5
CLASSIFICATION: Minor, Editorial
DESCRIPTION: The word "directed" seems redundant. Is not all motion in a direction?
PROPOSED SOLUTION: Remove "directed".
RESOLUTION:

ISSUE: USA-Mandate1-41
AUTHOR: US
CLAUSE: 3.4.11, page 6
CLASSIFICATION: Minor, Editorial
DESCRIPTION: There are extra blank lines after this clause.
PROPOSED SOLUTION: Remove the blank lines.
RESOLUTION:

ISSUE: USA-Mandate1-42
AUTHOR: US
CLAUSE: 3.4.12, page 6
CLASSIFICATION: Minor, Editorial
DESCRIPTION: The sentence makes no sense.
PROPOSED SOLUTION: Rewrite.
RESOLUTION:

ISSUE: USA-Mandate1-43
AUTHOR: US
CLAUSE: 3.4.12, footnote, page 6
CLASSIFICATION: Minor, Editorial
DESCRIPTION: Why is a definition in a footnote?
PROPOSED SOLUTION: Change from a footnote to a note.
RESOLUTION:

ISSUE: USA-Mandate1-44
AUTHOR: US
CLAUSE: 3.4.13, page 6
CLASSIFICATION: Minor, Editorial
DESCRIPTION: "The act of convert or transform material" is not good English.
PROPOSED SOLUTION: Change "convert" to "converting" and "transform" to "transforming".
RESOLUTION:

ISSUE: USA-Mandate1-45
AUTHOR: US
CLAUSE: 3.4.14, page 6
CLASSIFICATION: Minor, Editorial
DESCRIPTION: The word "act" seems to fit better than "function".

PROPOSED SOLUTION: Change "function" to "act".

RESOLUTION:

ISSUE: USA-Mandate1-46

AUTHOR: US

CLAUSE: 3.4.15, page 6

CLASSIFICATION: Minor, Editorial

DESCRIPTION: "settings appropriate levels" is incorrect English.

PROPOSED SOLUTION: Change "settings" to "setting".

RESOLUTION:

ISSUE: USA-Mandate1-47

AUTHOR: US

CLAUSE: 3.4.15, page 6

CLASSIFICATION: Minor, Editorial

DESCRIPTION: "the various" is redundant.

PROPOSED SOLUTION: Remove.

RESOLUTION:

ISSUE: USA-Mandate1-48

AUTHOR: US

CLAUSE: 3.4.16, page 6

CLASSIFICATION: Minor, Editorial

DESCRIPTION: "in the context of its purpose" is too wordy.

PROPOSED SOLUTION: Change to "for its purpose".

RESOLUTION:

ISSUE: USA-Mandate1-49

AUTHOR: US

CLAUSE: 3.4.15, page 6

CLASSIFICATION: Minor, Editorial

DESCRIPTION: What does "finalized by a global purpose" mean?

PROPOSED SOLUTION: Rewrite.

RESOLUTION:

ISSUE: USA-Mandate1-50

AUTHOR: US

CLAUSE: 3.4.17

CLASSIFICATION: Minor, Technical

DESCRIPTION: What is an "enterprise entity". Without a definition of this term, the definition in 3.4.17 is very vague.

PROPOSED SOLUTION: Add a definition of enterprise entity or change this definition. Harmonize with the definitions in 10303-49.

RESOLUTION:

ISSUE: USA-Mandate1-51

AUTHOR: US

CLAUSE: 3.4.17

CLASSIFICATION: Minor, Technical

DESCRIPTION: What is a "global purpose"?

PROPOSED SOLUTION: Give definition of global purpose or change the definition.

RESOLUTION:

ISSUE: USA-Mandate1-52

AUTHOR: US

CLAUSE: 3.4.19

CLASSIFICATION: Minor, Technical

DESCRIPTION: Recommend changing the term "achieve" to "effect". The rationale is that a plan does not achieve a process, a person achieves a process.

PROPOSED SOLUTION:

RESOLUTION:

ISSUE: USA-Mandate1-53

AUTHOR: US

CLAUSE: 3.4.19, page 7

CLASSIFICATION: Minor, Technical

DESCRIPTION: A process plan is not a representation of a package of information, it is the package.

PROPOSED SOLUTION:

RESOLUTION:

ISSUE: USA-Mandate1-54

AUTHOR: US

CLAUSE: 3.4.20, page 7

CLASSIFICATION: Minor, Technical

DESCRIPTION: The second sentence should be a note.

PROPOSED SOLUTION:

RESOLUTION:

ISSUE: USA-Mandate1-55

AUTHOR: US

CLAUSE: 3.4.24, page 7

CLASSIFICATION: Minor, Technical

DESCRIPTION: What are "the marketing projections"?

PROPOSED SOLUTION:

RESOLUTION:

ISSUE: USA-Mandate1-56

AUTHOR: US

CLAUSE: 3.4.24, page 7

CLASSIFICATION: Minor, Editorial

DESCRIPTION: The word "the" should not be there.

PROPOSED SOLUTION:

RESOLUTION:

ISSUE: USA-Mandate1-57

AUTHOR: US

CLAUSE: 3.4.30, page 8

CLASSIFICATION: Minor, Technical

DESCRIPTION: The definition does not seem to add a lot of value over the dictionary definition.

PROPOSED SOLUTION: Delete the definition.

RESOLUTION:

ISSUE: USA-Mandate1-58

AUTHOR: US

CLAUSE: 3.4.31, page 8

CLASSIFICATION: Minor, Technical

DESCRIPTION: The definition does not seem to add a lot of value over the dictionary definition.

PROPOSED SOLUTION: Delete the definition.

RESOLUTION:

ISSUE: USA-Mandate1-59

AUTHOR: US

CLAUSE: 4.1, paragraph 1, page 9

CLASSIFICATION: Minor, Technical

DESCRIPTION: The second sentence is unnecessary. People should be able to use the standard for whatever purpose for which they find value.

PROPOSED SOLUTION: Delete the sentence.

RESOLUTION:

ISSUE: USA-Mandate1-60

AUTHOR: US

CLAUSE: 4.1, paragraph 1, page 9

CLASSIFICATION: Minor, Editorial

DESCRIPTION: "loose" is the wrong word.

PROPOSED SOLUTION: Change to "lose".

RESOLUTION:

ISSUE: USA-Mandate1-61

AUTHOR: US

CLAUSE: 4.1, paragraph 2, page 9

CLASSIFICATION: Minor, Editorial

DESCRIPTION: The paragraph ends with "..."

PROPOSED SOLUTION: Delete the "..." and place "and" before "cutting tools".

RESOLUTION:

ISSUE: USA-Mandate1-62

AUTHOR: US

CLAUSE: 4.1, paragraph 3 (first paragraph on page), page 10

CLASSIFICATION: Minor, Editorial

DESCRIPTION: The word "separated" is incorrect and unnecessary.

PROPOSED SOLUTION: Delete it.

RESOLUTION:

ISSUE: USA-Mandate1-63

AUTHOR: US

CLAUSE: 4.1, paragraph 4 (second paragraph on page), page 10

CLASSIFICATION: Minor, Editorial

DESCRIPTION: "ISO 15531 is developed within ISO TC184/SC4" is unnecessary and inappropriate for this clause.

PROPOSED SOLUTION: Delete it.

RESOLUTION:

ISSUE: USA-Mandate1-64

AUTHOR: US

CLAUSE: 4.1, paragraph 4 (second paragraph on page), page 10

CLASSIFICATION: Minor, Editorial

DESCRIPTION: In "makes use of components description", an article is missing before "components". It is not clear

PROPOSED SOLUTION: Delete it.

RESOLUTION:

ISSUE: USA-Mandate1-65

AUTHOR: US

CLAUSE: 4.1, paragraph 4 (second paragraph on page), page 10

CLASSIFICATION: Minor, Technical

DESCRIPTION: The sentences starting with "Then ISO 15531 shall be" through the end of the paragraph sound like a requirements statement for the standard. As such, they do not belong here.

PROPOSED SOLUTION: Delete them.

RESOLUTION:

ISSUE: USA-Mandate1-66

AUTHOR: US

CLAUSE: 4.2-4.4, pages 10-12

CLASSIFICATION: Minor, Editorial

DESCRIPTION: "Those parts" is not correct English.

PROPOSED SOLUTION: Change to "The parts in this series".

RESOLUTION:

ISSUE: USA-Mandate1-67

AUTHOR: US

CLAUSE: 4.2, paragraph 1, page 10

CLASSIFICATION: Minor, Editorial

DESCRIPTION: There is an extra space between "exchange" and "and" in the second sentence.

PROPOSED SOLUTION: Remove it.

RESOLUTION:

ISSUE: USA-Mandate1-68

AUTHOR: US

CLAUSE: 4.2, paragraph 1, page 10

CLASSIFICATION: Minor, Editorial

DESCRIPTION: "Such as" should not be used in normative text.

PROPOSED SOLUTION: Make the text following "such as" into a note or example.

RESOLUTION:

ISSUE: USA-Mandate1-69

AUTHOR: US

CLAUSE: 4.2, paragraph 2, page 10

CLASSIFICATION: Minor, Technical

DESCRIPTION: "have to be considered" by whom? Is this a requirement on the implementations of ISO 15531, or on the developers of ISO 15531? If it is the latter, it does not belong here.

PROPOSED SOLUTION: Remove or clarify who has to consider.

RESOLUTION:

ISSUE: USA-Mandate1-70

AUTHOR: US

CLAUSE: 4.2, paragraph 3, page 10

CLASSIFICATION: Minor, Editorial

DESCRIPTION: "Those parts of the standard to enable" is incorrect English.

PROPOSED SOLUTION: Delete "to".

RESOLUTION:

ISSUE: USA-Mandate1-71

AUTHOR: US
CLAUSE: 4.2, paragraph 3, page 10
CLASSIFICATION: Minor, Editorial
DESCRIPTION: "for the quality management" is poor English.
PROPOSED SOLUTION: Delete "the".
RESOLUTION:

ISSUE: USA-Mandate1-72
AUTHOR: US
CLAUSE: 4.2, paragraph 3, page 10
CLASSIFICATION: Minor, Editorial
DESCRIPTION: "libraries will are developed" is incorrect English.
PROPOSED SOLUTION: Change to "will be developed".
RESOLUTION:

ISSUE: USA-Mandate1-73
AUTHOR: US
CLAUSE: 4.2, paragraph 3, page 10
CLASSIFICATION: Minor, Technical
DESCRIPTION: In "libraries will be developed", who will develop the libraries?
PROPOSED SOLUTION: Clarify who will develop the libraries.
RESOLUTION:

ISSUE: USA-Mandate1-74
AUTHOR: US
CLAUSE: 4.2, bullet items 2 and 3, page 10
CLASSIFICATION: Minor, Technical
DESCRIPTION: "Information needed": needed by whom?
PROPOSED SOLUTION: Clarify who needs the information.
RESOLUTION:

ISSUE: USA-Mandate1-75
AUTHOR: US
CLAUSE: 4.2
CLASSIFICATION: Minor, Technical
DESCRIPTION: EDI is first mentioned here. It is not in the normative references and is not explained anywhere before this usage.
PROPOSED SOLUTION: Give a normative reference or explain what EDI process you speak of.
RESOLUTION:

ISSUE: USA-Mandate1-76
AUTHOR: US
CLAUSE: 4.2, last list
CLASSIFICATION: Minor, Technical
DESCRIPTION: The clause is for external exchanges. Except for the first item in the list, all information does not discuss external exchanges, but internal database information.
PROPOSED SOLUTION: Clarify what the external exchange is.
RESOLUTION:

ISSUE: USA-Mandate1-77
AUTHOR: US
CLAUSE: 4.3
CLASSIFICATION: Major, Technical

DESCRIPTION: The clause states that a companion standard is to model the resources. Is this 10303? Is this PLIB? You need to state what the standard is and how it relates.

PROPOSED SOLUTION: See the description. Possibly subtype the current ISO 10303 integrated resources for their respective capability and then add the information listed in 4.3 as different attributes.

RESOLUTION:

ISSUE: USA-Mandate1-78

AUTHOR: US

CLAUSE: 4.3, paragraph 1, page 11

CLASSIFICATION: Minor, Editorial

DESCRIPTION: "Those parts refers to the resource usage management" is bad English.

PROPOSED SOLUTION: Change to "Parts in this series refer" or "This series of parts refers".

RESOLUTION:

ISSUE: USA-Mandate1-79

AUTHOR: US

CLAUSE: 4.3, paragraph 2, page 11

CLASSIFICATION: Minor, Technical

DESCRIPTION: "Three different aspects are to be considered": are they considered in the current standard or not?

PROPOSED SOLUTION: If the three aspects are currently considered, delete "to be".

RESOLUTION:

ISSUE: USA-Mandate1-80

AUTHOR: US

CLAUSE: 4.3, paragraph 5, page 11

CLASSIFICATION: Minor, Technical

DESCRIPTION: What is meant by "model, form and attributes" of data?

PROPOSED SOLUTION: Clarify.

RESOLUTION:

ISSUE: USA-Mandate1-81

AUTHOR: US

CLAUSE: 4.4, page 12

CLASSIFICATION: Major, Technical

DESCRIPTION: Process control and peer to peer communication are defined by other ISO standards such as ISO/IEC 9506 Manufacturing Message Specification.

PROPOSED SOLUTION: This aspect of 15531 needs to address interfacing ISO 10303 and PLIB into these other standards and working these interfaces and not duplicating their efforts.

RESOLUTION:

ISSUE: USA-Mandate1-82

CLAUSE: 4.4, paragraph 1, page 12

AUTHOR: US

CLASSIFICATION: Minor, Editorial

DESCRIPTION: There should not be a comma after "elements" in the second line.

PROPOSED SOLUTION: Remove the comma.

RESOLUTION:

ISSUE: USA-Mandate1-83

CLAUSE: 4.4, paragraph 3, page 12

AUTHOR: US

CLASSIFICATION: Minor, Editorial

DESCRIPTION: There is an extra space before "provision". The dash between "information" and "with a maximum" is unnecessary.

PROPOSED SOLUTION: Delete them.

RESOLUTION:

ISSUE: USA-Mandate1-84

CLAUSE: 4.4, paragraph 3, page 12

AUTHOR: US

CLASSIFICATION: Minor, Editorial

DESCRIPTION: There should be a comma after "Focused on the production process".

PROPOSED SOLUTION: Add a comma.

RESOLUTION:

ISSUE: USA-Mandate1-85

CLAUSE: 4.4, paragraph 4, page 12

AUTHOR: US

CLASSIFICATION: Minor, Technical

DESCRIPTION: The term "construct" is not defined.

PROPOSED SOLUTION: Add a definition to Clause 3 or reword this sentence to say what you mean.

RESOLUTION:

ISSUE: USA-Mandate1-86

CLAUSE: 4.4, paragraph 5, page 12

AUTHOR: US

CLASSIFICATION: Minor, Technical

DESCRIPTION: The terms "building block" and "semantic information unit" are not defined.

PROPOSED SOLUTION: Add definitions to Clause 3 or reword this sentence to say what you mean.

RESOLUTION:

ISSUE: USA-Mandate1-87

CLAUSE: 4.4, last paragraph on page, page 12

AUTHOR: US

CLASSIFICATION: Minor, Editorial

DESCRIPTION: The term "globally" is meaningless.

PROPOSED SOLUTION: Delete "globally" or explain what you mean.

RESOLUTION:

ISSUE: USA-Mandate1-88

AUTHOR: US

CLAUSE: 5

CLASSIFICATION: Minor, Technical

DESCRIPTION: The specific numbering of non-existent parts in a standard is not valid. You need to talk about what are the areas of interest--these standards may never be approved.

PROPOSED SOLUTION: Talk in series of parts and not specific part numbers.

RESOLUTION:

ISSUE: USA-Mandate1-89

AUTHOR: US

CLAUSE: 6 and 7

CLASSIFICATION: Major, Editorial

DESCRIPTION: Since these are informative, they need to be annexes.

PROPOSED SOLUTION:

RESOLUTION:

ISSUE: USA-Mandate1-90

AUTHOR: US

CLAUSE: 6, page 15

CLASSIFICATION: Major, Technical

DESCRIPTION: The words indicate that the other standards efforts will be "reconsidered". This is not what SC4 should do!

PROPOSED SOLUTION: SC4 should work with these other standards efforts to harmonize and/or interface to these standards. Formal liaisons should be established and worked.

RESOLUTION:

ISSUE: USA-Mandate1-91

AUTHOR: US

CLAUSE: 6, page 15

CLASSIFICATION: Major, Editorial

DESCRIPTION: This clause should be an annex. Also, I do not see any mapping here.

PROPOSED SOLUTION: Move to an annex, and remove the words "Mapping and" from the title.

RESOLUTION:

ISSUE: USA-Mandate1-92

AUTHOR: US

CLAUSE: 6, paragraph 5, page 15

CLASSIFICATION: Minor, Technical

DESCRIPTION: What is meant by the three dots at the end of the paragraph?

PROPOSED SOLUTION: Spell out completely what you mean.

RESOLUTION:

ISSUE: USA-Mandate1-93

AUTHOR: US

CLAUSE: 7

CLASSIFICATION: Major, Technical

DESCRIPTION: The words relating to MANDATE being the framework for manufacturing management data for other standards and bringing other standards under a generic framework is good, but the personnel resources to accomplish are not in place. If this path is pursued, then formal liaisons with these other standards efforts are needed (with requisite travel and personnel commitments).

PROPOSED SOLUTION:

RESOLUTION:

ISSUE: USA-Mandate1-94

AUTHOR: US

CLAUSE: 7, pages 17-19

CLASSIFICATION: Major, Technical

DESCRIPTION: This section reads like a position paper or proposal rather than a standard. In fact, the fourth sentence says "are proposed".

PROPOSED SOLUTION: Move to an Annex or delete completely from this standard and make it an N-numbered document.

RESOLUTION:

ISSUE: USA-Mandate1-95

AUTHOR: US

CLAUSE: 7, last paragraph on page, page 17

CLASSIFICATION: Minor, Editorial

DESCRIPTION: There is an extra space after "resources".

PROPOSED SOLUTION: Delete the space.

RESOLUTION:

ISSUE: USA-Mandate1-96

AUTHOR: US

CLAUSE: 7, last paragraph, page 19

CLASSIFICATION: Minor, Technical

DESCRIPTION: The phrase "more or less implicitly" is too fuzzy.

PROPOSED SOLUTION: Be more precise.

RESOLUTION:

ISSUE: USA-Mandate1-97

AUTHOR: US

CLAUSE: 7, pages 17-19

CLASSIFICATION: Minor, Editorial

DESCRIPTION: "within the TC184" is incorrect English.

PROPOSED SOLUTION: Delete the word "the".

RESOLUTION:

ISSUE: USA-Mandate1-98

AUTHOR: US

CLAUSE: Annex A

CLASSIFICATION: Minor, Editorial

DESCRIPTION: What is APICS dictionary?

PROPOSED SOLUTION: Give a correct bibliography reference.

RESOLUTION:

Filename: sc4n677
Directory: I:\sc4\docs
Template: C:\Program Files\Microsoft Office\Office\Normal.dot
Title:
Subject:
Author: Mike Washington
Keywords:
Comments:
Creation Date: 01/29/98 5:37 PM
Change Number: 2
Last Saved On: 01/29/98 5:37 PM
Last Saved By: trager
Total Editing Time: 2 Minutes
Last Printed On: 08/19/98 1:40 PM
As of Last Complete Printing
Number of Pages: 19
Number of Words: 4,478 (approx.)
Number of Characters: 25,526 (approx.)